

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-17 and 20-22 are now pending in the application. Claims 8 and 18-19 are cancelled herein. The claim 1 is amended herein to include the subject matter of claim 8 along with additional elements. Claims 12-15 are amended herein. Claim 17 is amended herein to include the subject matter of claims 18 and 19. Claim 22 is added herein. No new matter is added.

The Examiner is respectfully thanked for the Telephonic Interview of September 22, 2005. During the Interview, no exhibits were given nor any demonstrations conducted. The rejection of claims 3-6, 8, 11, 12 and 19 were discussed relative to the prior art of record. Applicant agreed to amend the claims, as shown below, and submit arguments in favor of patentability. The Examiner indicated that such amendments appear to define over the prior art but that a new search would be required. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 7 and 12-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McElreath (U.S. Pat. No. 6,401,013). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 is amended herein to include the subject matter of claim 8. Thus, for at least this reason it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated by the McElreath reference is now rendered moot. Claim 17 is amended herein to include the subject matter of claims 18 and 19. Accordingly, it is respectfully

submitted that the anticipation rejection of claim 17 based on the McElreath reference is now rendered moot. Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and, accordingly, it is respectfully submitted the rejection of claim 7 as being anticipated by the McElreath reference is now moot. Claim 18 is cancelled herein. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 7, 17 and 18 as being anticipated by the McElreath reference is respectfully requested.

Claim 12 calls for:

“establishing rules that dictate when the avionics display can display information from the non-certified source and when the avionics display must display information from the certified source; and preventing the displaying of the non-certified information when the rules dictate that the avionics display should not display the non-certified information so that application spoofing cannot occur.”

It is respectfully submitted that this subject matter is not disclosed, taught nor suggested by the prior art of record. Rather, the McElreath reference merely teaches the use of a menu for controlling the integrated cockpit display that would be adapted to allow for termination of display of information normally displayed thereon and the commencement of a display of information from a laptop pc. Furthermore, the McElreath reference discloses that there are times during operation of the flight that a laptop pc may not be operated. See column 1, lines 37-41 and column 4, lines 12-17 of the McElreath reference. The requirement for shutting down a laptop pc is completely unrelated to establishing rules that dictate when a display can display information from a non-certified source and when it must display information from a certified source. Moreover, the non-certified source is not limited to an on-board pc or component that would be required to be shut down during certain periods of flight operation. Thus, this teaching of the McElreath reference is completely unrelated to the subject matter called for in claim 12. Additionally, the McElreath reference is completely silent about when an

avionics display must display information from a certified source. Thus, for at least these reasons it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is patentable over the McElreath reference. Claims 13-16 all depend from claim 12 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons stated above with reference to claim 12 are also patentable over the prior art of record. Thus, withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-6, 8 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McElreath in view of Doll et al. (EP 429,387). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, which is amended herein to include the subject matter of claim 8, calls for:

“displaying the information on the display area in front of the certified display so that the information is visible on the avionics display, at least a portion of the certified display is visible on the avionics display and the information covers a portion of the certified display that would otherwise be displayed.”

In contrast, the Doll reference appears to be silent about the displaying of non-secured (non-certified) information over top of secured (certified) information such that a portion of the secured information is covered that would otherwise be displayed. With the Doll reference lacking any teaching, suggestion or motivation to provide such a display arrangement, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is non-obvious and patentable. Claims 3-6 all depend from claim 1 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons stated above are also non-obvious and patentable. Thus, withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

Claim 17 is amended to include the subject matter of claims 18 and 19. As such, claim 17 calls for “providing the non-certified source with a false indication of the size of the display area so that the non-certified source is not capable of addressing the entire display area.” Similarly, claim 3 calls for “providing the non-certified source with a false indication of the size of the display area so that the non-certified source is not capable of addressing the entire display area.” In contrast, the Doll reference merely discloses that a display unit is supplied with the information of the boundaries within which information is to be displayed (the entire display area). The Doll reference also discloses that an area within (or congruent to) the supplied boundaries is established wherein information can be displayed without restriction. See column 1, line 51 – column 2, line 1 of the Doll reference. Thus, the Doll reference discloses a display area having a partitioned area within which information to be contained therein is free of restriction. The Doll reference, however, does not disclose providing a false indication of the size of the display area as called for. That is, the subject matter of the claims calls for a specific manner in which the non-certified source is restricted or prevented from addressing an entire display area. The Doll reference, in contrast, does not provide any teachings or disclosure about a specific manner in which this may be achieved, much less the manner called for in claims 17 and 3. Furthermore, claims 4-6 all call for additional ways of providing the false indication of the size. Thus, for at least these reasons it is respectfully submitted that claims 17 and 3 are non-obvious and patentable over the prior art of record. Claim 20 depends from claim 17 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons stated above with reference to claim 17 is also non-obvious and patentable. Thus, withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

Claims 9-10 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McElreath and Oran et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,757,371). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 9-10 and 21 all depend from one of claims 1 and 17. Thus, for at least the same reasons stated above with reference to claims 1 and 17 are also non-obvious and patentable over the prior art of record. Thus, withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McElreath, Oran et al. and Hanafée et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,342,926). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 depends from claim 9. Claim 9 calls for “displaying a visual indicator on the display area whenever the information is being displayed.” Claim 11 calls for “displaying the visual indicator on a portion of the display area that is used to display the information.” In contrast, the Hanafée reference discloses the displaying of information on a display for a limited period of time. That is, the information is displayed only for a predetermined period of time upon the expiration of which the information is no longer displayed. Thus, the Hanafée reference specifically discloses the limiting of the display to a particular time. See at least column 4, lines 31-40 and Figure 2 of the Hanafée reference. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art of record does not teach the selection of which display of information (certified or non-certified) should have a visual indicator thereon. Thus, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claim 11 is non-obvious and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 26, 2005

By: 
Jeffrey H. Urian, Reg. No. 46,232

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JHU/ps